

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and maintain their arguments from their previous response, filed on June 24, 2005.

Claim 1 recites:

1. (Original) A storage server in a storage area network **connecting a plurality of host computers and a plurality of storage devices**, said storage server **comprising:**
 - a plurality of storage processors associated with said plurality of host computers and said plurality of storage devices, wherein said plurality of storage processors receives a plurality of command packets and a plurality of data packets;
 - a switching circuit connecting said plurality of storage processors;
 - and
 - a microengine, wherein said microengine is configured to execute processing comprising:
 - configuring a path between a first storage processor and a second storage processor of said plurality of storage processors, via said switching circuit, in accordance with a command packet of said plurality of command packets; and
 - routing a data packet of said plurality of data packets over said path, prior to completely receiving said data packet, between said first storage processor and said second storage processor via said switching circuit. (Emphasis added.)

Watanabe fails to disclose or suggest a storage server which, per claim 1, connects a plurality of host computers and a plurality of storage devices, and which comprises (includes) a plurality of storage processors. In claim 1, the plurality of storage processors, the switching circuit and the microengine all follow the word "comprising", and therefore, they are all by definition elements of (included in) the claimed "storage server". Watanabe does not disclose or suggest a storage server which includes these elements, as recited.

In the previous response Applicants argued, "Watanabe nowhere teaches or suggests the switch having more than one processor" The Examiner was not

persuaded, responding, "Nowhere in the claim language does it claim, 'the switch has more than one processor'. According to the claim language, the switching circuit connects a plurality of storage processors." (Final Office Action, p. 9.)

The "switch" mentioned in Applicants' above-quoted argument was the switch in Watanabe (see, e.g., Fig. 2), not the switching circuit in Applicant's claim. This is because Applicants assumed that the Examiner was trying to read the switch 110 in Watanabe on Applicants' claimed "storage server". The point Applicants were making is this:

Watanabe nowhere teaches or suggest a storage server which, per claim 1, connects a plurality of host computers and a plurality of storage devices and which comprises more than one storage processor, which are connected by a switching circuit in the storage server. Applicants find no element in Watanabe, other than the switch 110, which connects a plurality of host computers and a plurality of storage devices; yet the switch in Watanabe is not disclosed as comprising more than one storage processor (connected by a switching circuit), as required by claim 1.

For at least this reason, therefore, claim 1 and all claims which depend on it are believed to be patentable over the cited art. Independent method claim 19 includes similar limitations and is, therefore, patentable over the cited art for similar reasons along with all of its dependent claims.

Similarly, Watanabe fails to disclose a microengine which can route packets via a switching circuit that is part of a storage server (per the term "comprising" in claim 1) which connects multiple hosts and multiple storage devices, per claim 1. Independent

method claim 19 includes similar limitations and is, therefore, patentable over the cited art for similar reasons along with all of its dependent claims.

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

Conclusion


Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 947-8200.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: October 7, 2005


Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200